

English Language and Composition
Reading Time: 15 minutes
Suggested Writing Time: 40 minutes

Directions: The following prompt is based on the accompanying six sources.

This question requires you to integrate a variety of sources into a coherent, well-written essay. *Refer to the sources to support your position; avoid mere paraphrase or summary. Your argument should be central; the sources should support this argument.*

Remember to attribute both direct and indirect citations.

Introduction

Television has been influential in United States presidential elections since the 1960's. But just what is this influence, and how has it affected who is elected? Has it made elections fairer and more accessible, or has it moved candidates from pursuing issues to pursuing image?

Assignment

Read the following sources (including any introductory information) carefully. **Then, in an essay that synthesizes at least three of the sources for support, take a position that defends, challenges, or qualifies the claim that television has had a positive impact on presidential elections.**

Refer to the sources as Source A, Source B, etc.; titles are included for your convenience.

Source A (Campbell)
Source B (Hart and Tiece)
Source C (Menand)
Source D (Chart)
Source E (Ranney)
Source F (Koppel)

SAMPLE QUESTION ONLY: DRAFT FORMAT

Source A

Campbell, Angus. "Has Television Reshaped Politics? " In *Encyclopedia of Television / Museum of Broadcast Communications*, vol. 1, ed. Horace Newcomb. New York: Fitzroy Dearborn, 2005.

The following passage is excerpted from an article about television's impact on politics.

The advent of television in the late 1940's gave rise to the belief that a new era was opening in public communication. As Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, put it: "Not even the sky is the limit." One of the great contributions expected of television lay in its presumed capacity to inform and stimulate the political interests of the American electorate.

"Television, with its penetration, its wide geographic distribution and impact, provides a new, direct, and sensitive link between Washington and the people," said Dr. Stanton. "The people have once more become the nation, as they have not been since the days when we were small enough each to know his elected representative. As we grew, we lost this feeling of direct contact—television has now restored it."

As time has passed, events have seemed to give substance to this expectation. The televising of important congressional hearings, the national nominating conventions, and most recently the Nixon-Kennedy and other debates have appeared to make a novel contribution to the political life of the nation. Large segments of the public have been given a new, immediate contact with political events. Television has appeared to be fulfilling its early promise.

SAMPLE QUESTION ONLY: DRAFT FORMAT

Source B

Hart, Roderick P., and Mary Triece, "U.S. Presidency and Television." Available at http://www.museum.tv/debateweb/html/equalizer/essay_usprestv.htm.

The following passage is excerpted from an online article that provides a timeline of major events when television and the presidency have intersected.

April 20, 1992: Not a historic date perhaps, but a suggestive one. It was on this date [while campaigning for President] that Bill Clinton discussed his underwear with the American people (briefs, not boxers, as it turned out). Why would the leader of the free world unburden himself like this? Why not? In television's increasingly postmodern world, all texts—serious and sophomoric—swirl together in the same discontinuous field of experience. To be sure, Mr. Clinton made his disclosure because he had been asked to do so by a member of the MTV generation, not because he felt a sudden need to purge himself. But in doing so Clinton exposed several rules connected to the new phenomenology of politics: (1) because of television's celebrity system, Presidents are losing their distinctiveness as social actors and hence are often judged by standards formerly used to assess rock singers and movie stars; (2) because of television's sense of intimacy, the American people feel they know their Presidents as persons and hence no longer feel the need for party guidance; (3) because of the medium's archly cynical worldview, those who watch politics on television are increasingly turning away from the policy sphere, years of hyperfamiliarity having finally bred contempt for politics itself.

SAMPLE QUESTION ONLY: DRAFT FORMAT

Source C

Menand, Louis, “Masters of the Matrix: Kennedy, Nixon, and the Culture of the Image.” *The New Yorker*, January 5, 2004.

The following passage is excerpted from a weekly literary and cultural magazine.

Holding a presidential election today without a television debate would seem almost undemocratic, as though voters were being cheated by the omission of some relevant test, some necessary submission to mass scrutiny.

That’s not what many people thought at the time of the first debates. Theodore H. White, who subscribed fully to [John F.] Kennedy’s view that the debates had made the difference in the election, complained, in *The Making of the President 1960*, that television had dumbed down the issues by forcing the candidates to respond to questions instantaneously. . . . He also believed that Kennedy’s “victory” in the debates was largely a triumph of image over content. People who listened to the debates on the radio, White pointed out, scored it a draw; people who watched it thought that, except in the third debate, Kennedy had crushed [Richard M.] Nixon. (This little statistic has been repeated many times as proof of the distorting effects of television. Why not the distorting effects of radio? It also may be that people whose medium of choice or opportunity in 1960 was radio tended to fit a Nixon rather than a Kennedy demographic.) White thought that Kennedy benefited because his image on television was “crisp”; Nixon’s—light-colored suit, wrong makeup, bad posture—was “fuzzed.” “In 1960 television had won the nation away from sound to images,” he concluded, “and that was that.”

. . . “Our national politics has become a competition for images or between images, rather than between ideals,” [one commentator] concluded. “An effective President must be every year more concerned with projecting images of himself.”

SAMPLE QUESTION ONLY: DRAFT FORMAT

Source D

Adapted from *Nielsen Tunes into Politics: Tracking the Presidential Election Years (1960-1992)*. New York: Nielsen Media Research, 1994.

TELEVISION RATINGS FOR PRESIDENTIAL DEBATES: 1960-1996

Year	Networks	Candidates	Date	Rating	Homes (millions)	People (millions)
1960	ABC CBS NBC	Kennedy-Nixon	Sept. 26	59.5	28.1	N/A
1964 1968 1972	NO DEBATES					
1976	ABC CBS NBC	Carter-Ford	Oct. 6	52.4	37.3	63.9
1980	ABC CBS NBC	Anderson-Carter-Reagan	Oct. 28	58.9	45.8	80.6
1984	ABC CBS NBC	Mondale-Reagan	Oct. 7	45.3	38.5	65.1
1988	ABC CBS NBC	Bush-Dukakis	Sept. 25	36.8	33.3	65.1
1992	ABC NBC CNN	Bush-Clinton-Perot	Oct. 11	38.3	35.7	62.4
1996	ABC CBS NBC CNN FOX	Clinton-Dole	Oct. 6	31.6	30.6	46.1

SAMPLE QUESTION ONLY: DRAFT FORMAT

Source E

Ranney, Austin, *Channels of Power: The Impact of Television on American Politics*. New York: Basic Books, 1983.

The following passage is taken from a book that examines the relationship between politics in the United States and television.

In early 1968 [when President Lyndon Johnson was running for reelection], after five years of steadily increasing American commitment of troops and arms to the war in Vietnam, President Johnson was still holding fast to the policy that the war could and must be won. However, his favorite television newsman, CBS's Walter Cronkite, became increasingly skeptical about the stream of official statements from Washington and Saigon that claimed we were winning the war. So Cronkite decided to go to Vietnam and see for himself. When he returned, he broadcast a special report to the nation, which Lyndon Johnson watched. Cronkite reported that the war had become a bloody stalemate and that military victory was not in the cards. He concluded: "It is increasingly clear to this reporter that the only rational way out . . . will be to negotiate, not as victors, but as an honorable people who lived up to their pledge to defend democracy, and did the best they could."

On hearing Cronkite's verdict, the President turned to his aides and said, "It's all over." Johnson was a great believer in public opinion polls, and he knew that a recent poll had shown that the American people trusted Walter Cronkite more than any other American to "tell it the way it is." Moreover, Johnson himself liked and respected Cronkite more than any other newsman. As Johnson's aide Bill Moyers put it later, "We always knew . . . that Cronkite had more authority with the American people than anyone else. It was Johnson's instinct that Cronkite was it." So if Walter Cronkite thought that the war was hopeless, the American people would think so too, and the only thing left was to wind it down. A few weeks after Cronkite's broadcast Johnson, in a famous broadcast of his own, announced that he was ending the air and naval bombardment in most of Vietnam—and that he would not run for another term as President.

SAMPLE QUESTION ONLY: DRAFT FORMAT

Source F

Koppel, Ted. *Off Camera: Private Thoughts Made Public*. New York: Vintage Books, 2001.

The following reflections come from the printed journal of Ted Koppel, a newscaster who is best known for appearing on the news show Nightline.

All of us in commercial television are confronted by a difficult choice that commercialism imposes. Do we deliberately aim for the lowest common denominator, thereby assuring ourselves of the largest possible audience but producing nothing but cotton candy for the mind, or do we tackle the difficult subjects as creatively as we can, knowing that we may lose much of the mass audience? The good news is that even those aiming low these days are failing, more often than not, to get good ratings.

It is after midnight and we have just finished our *Nightline* program on the first Republican presidential “debate” involving all of the candidates. . . .

It is a joke to call an event like the one that transpired tonight a debate. Two reporters sat and asked questions of one of the candidates after another. Each man was supposed to answer only the question he was asked, and was given a minute and thirty seconds in which to do so. Since the next candidate would then be asked another question altogether, it was an act of rhetorical contortion for one man to address himself to what one of his rivals had said. . . .

Because we were able to pull the best three or four minutes out of the ninety-minute event, *Nightline* made the whole thing look pretty good. That’s the ultimate irony.

SAMPLE QUESTION ONLY: DRAFT FORMAT